

### REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The final Office Action of March 22, 2004 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 3. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-5 and 7-9 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2 as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments in claim 3, this rejection is now believed to be moot, and claim 3 is in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chung et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,184); rejected claims 1, 3-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,667,854); rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Yamada et al.; rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Scheuble et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,308,535); rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Hanmer et al. (WO 98/00475 A1); rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Yamada et al., in further view of Scheuble et al.; rejected claims 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung et al. in view of Yamada et al., in further view of Hanmer et al.; rejected claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Scheuble et al.; rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Hanmer et al. Applicant traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the optical film is a color filter." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 3-5 and 7-9, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.


Applicant respectfully submits that neither Chung et al. nor Yamada et al. teaches or suggests a method for fabricating a color filter having the elements or features recited in claim 1. As best understood, Chung et al. and Yamada et al. relate to an optical compensation film, not a color filter. Further, neither Scheuble et al. nor Hanmer et al. cures the deficiencies of Chung et al. and Yamada et al., claim 1 and claims 3-5 and 7-9, which depend therefrom, are allowable over.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496 - 7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: June 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant